

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
WESTERN DIVISION**

PARTIES' PROPOSED CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

I. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f), a meeting was held in 07-cv-6467 (case number) on 12-31-07 (date) and was attended by:

Rene Hernandez (name) for Plaintiff(s) Karen Dieter (party name)

Michael Cramer (name) for Defendant(s) Honeywell Int'l (party name)

II. The Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) material will be exchanged by 1-25-08.

III. Alternative Dispute Resolution Mediation. Counselors hereby certify that their clients have read the Pamphlet governing the court's mediation program, that counselors have discussed with their respective clients the available dispute resolution options provided by the court and private entities, and that counselors have given an estimation of the fees and costs that would be associated with the litigation of this matter, through trial, to their clients. Further, counselors have provided to their clients an estimate of the fees and expenses reasonably expected to be incurred through an early successful mediation. Counselors certify that they have discussed the available ADR options with their clients and have considered how this case might benefit from those options. Lastly, if this is a fee shifting case, defense counselors certify they have discussed the advantages and disadvantages of making a Rule 68 offer of judgment.

- ☐ Parties have agreed on early mediation. _____ has been chosen as the mediator. The mediation shall be held within 60 days of this order. Discovery (shall)(shall not) be stayed during the 60 days of referral. Pursuant to ADR local rules, this case is hereby referred to mediation. Counselors and parties will submit evaluations to the Court within ten days of the conclusion of mediation.
- ☐ Parties have agreed on mediation. _____ has been chosen as the mediator. The parties believe the best time to mediate would be _____ and request the matter be referred to mediation at that time. Counselors and parties will submit mediation evaluations to the Court within ten days of the conclusion of mediation.
- ☐ Parties request an immediate settlement conference with the Magistrate Judge.
- ☒ Parties plan to utilize private ADR. (Parties shall explain the private ADR and when it will take place). Private ADR will occur after exchange of Rule 26(a) disclosures.
- ☐ Parties request this case be excused from ADR.

IV. Discovery Plan. The parties jointly propose to the court the following discovery plan:

A) Discovery will be needed on the following subjects:

The circumstances surrounding Ms. Dieter's termination, including her work with Defendant Honeywell.

B) Maximum of 25 interrogatories by each party to any other party.

C) Maximum of 25 requests for admission by each party to any other party.

D) Maximum of 10 depositions by Plaintiff(s) and 10 by Defendant(s).

E) Each deposition [other than of] shall be limited to a maximum of 7 hours unless extended by agreement of the parties.

F) Fact discovery cut-off is set for June 16, 2008.

G) Report from retained expert for the Plaintiff under Rule 26(a)(2) due July 30, 2008. Deposition of Plaintiff's expert shall be taken by 8-30-08. Report from retained expert for Defendant under rule 26(a)(2) due 7-30-08. Deposition of Defendant's expert shall be taken by 8-30-08. Supplementations under Rule 26(e) will be scheduled by the court at the request of the parties. The parties do not believe expert testimony will be necessary and recommend waiting to set such a schedule; but if the court wishes to set a schedule now, I have agreed upon the above dates.

H) All discovery shall be cut off by 8-30-08 (should be no longer than date for Defendant's expert deposition).

I) Time for the parties to amend pleadings and add counts or parties is hereby established as 2/28/08.

J) The parties suggest the next discovery conference with the court be May 23, 2008.

All dispositive motions will be due 30 days after the fact discovery cut-off date unless otherwise ordered by the court and the parties agree pleadings, motions and briefs may be exchanged by e-mail, fax or other electronic means.

Jointly submitted,

S/ Rene Hernandez (by MDR)
Rene Hernandez
Counsel for Plaintiff

S/ Michael D. Ray
Michael D. Ray
Counsel for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that on January 3, 2008 he electronically filed the foregoing Amended Joint Initial Status Report/CMO. Notice of this filing will be sent via the Court's electronic filing system to:

Rene Hernandez, Esq.
Law Offices of Rene Hernandez, P.C.
Rockford, IL 61104
renesone@aol.com

Michael D. Ray